



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DIGEST OF OTHER RECENT VIRGINIA DECISIONS.**Supreme Court of Appeals.**

Note.—In this department we give the syllabus of every case decided by the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, except of such cases as are reported in full.

WELLS *v.* LAGORIO et al.

June 8, 1911.

[71 S. E. 713.]

Boundaries (§ 9*)—Location and Quantity of Land.—A vendor thought that he was selling all the land he owned, but his possessions were greater than he supposed. The purchasers were placed in possession of what each believed he purchased, and each knew the exact boundaries of the premises conveyed, and each received the identical parcel purchased. Held, that the purchasers acquired only the identical parcel purchased, as bounded by the lines pointed out, though they did not obtain the quantity of land they supposed they purchased.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see Boundaries, Cent. Dig. §§ 77-89; Dec. Dig. § 9.* 2 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 600; 13 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 522.]

Appeal from Circuit Court of City of Norfolk.

Suit by one Lagorio and others against A. B. Wells and others. From a decree granting relief, defendant Wells appeals. Reversed and rendered, dismissing the bill.

A. T. Stroud and W. L. Williams, for appellants.

Wm. W. Old & Son and M. W. Talbot, for appellees.

SAUNDERS et al. *v.* BANK OF MECKLENBURG et al.

June 8, 1911.

[71 S. E. 714.]

1. Bills and Notes (§ 106*)—Validity.—The taking of a note by a bank, pending proceedings for its dissolution, to secure a pre-existing indebtedness, was not engaging in new business, as affecting the right to enforce the note.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see Bills and Notes, Dec. Dig. § 106.* 2 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 317.]

2. Corporations (§ 608*)—Dissolution—Enforcement of Contracts.—Generally no defense can be made to a suit by a corporation on a contract made with it, that it has forfeited its charter for acts of

*For other cases see same topic and section NUMBER in Dec. Dig. & Am. Dig. Key No. Series & Rep'r Indexes.